



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,536	01/16/2002	Bing R. Hsieh	110250	7727
27074	7590	06/15/2005	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320				YAN, REN LUO
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2854		

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/683,536	HSIEH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Ren L. Yan	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2005.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 13-23 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 13-23 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/16/02, 4/16/02.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II, claims 10 and 13-23 in the reply filed on 3-22-2005 is acknowledged. In view of the amendments to the existing claims and the addition of new claims filed along with the reply, the restriction requirement set forth in the previous Office action is hereby withdrawn. Accordingly, all pending claims 1, 3-10 and 13-23 are currently examined together.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 8, 10, 18 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seachman et al(5,790,211) in view of Washio et al(6,301,022).

The patent to Seachman et al teaches the structure of an imaging device as claimed including a platen 4 having a surface upon which an original document 5 is placed, a light source 2 located on a side of the plate opposite the surface upon which the original document is placed, and a platen cover 6 for covering the document during the document scanning operation, wherein the platen cover 6 comprises a substrate 7 having a dark color surface 8 facing the surface of the platen 4. See Fig. 1 and column 3, lines 9-23 in Seachman et al for details. However, Seachman et al do not teach to use a fluorescent coating on the platen cover. Washio et al teach in a similar imaging device the conventional use of a fluorescent color coating provided on the entire platen

cover surface or a partial range sufficient to cover the surroundings of the document to achieve a higher reflectance than that of the background of the document. See column 13, lines 34-50 in Washio et al for example. In view of the teaching of Washio et al, it would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the platen cover of Seachman et al, with a fluorescent color coating in order to achieve higher light reflectance and to improve printing quality. With respect to claim 20, since the imaging device of Seachman et al is the same type as that of the present invention, it follows that the broadly recited photoreceptor upon which an electrostatic latent image is to be formed and one or more developing stations for developing the electrostatic latent image are inherent structural components of the imaging device of Seachman et al.

Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seachman et al in view of Washio et al as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Thomson et al(4,916,483). Seachman et al, as modified by Washio et al teach all that is claimed except for the platen cover being made of a plastic material. Thomson et al teach in a similar imaging device the use of a platen cover made of a plastic material. See column 3, lines 41-53 in Thomson et al for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the platen cover of Seachman et al, as modified by Washio et al made of a plastic material through injection molding as taught by Thomson et al for the ease of manufacture.

Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seachman et al in view of Washio et al and Thomson et al as applied to claims 3 and 13 above, and further in view of Deneau(4,157,412). The applied prior art teach all that is claimed except

that the type of pigment for forming the dark color platen cover surface is not disclosed. Deneau teaches the use of well known carbon black as a pigment of a dark color. See column 4, lines 17-26 in Deneau for example. In view of the teaching of Deneau, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the platen cover of Seachman et al, as modified by the applied prior art with carbon black as the pigment choice to form the dark color surface of the platen cover.

Claims 5-7 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seachman et al in view of Washio et al as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Hayashi et al(6,840,647). Seachman et al, as modified by Washio et al, teach all that is claimed except for the fluorescent color coating comprises a light-emitting polymer. Hayashi et al teach in a light device having a liquid crystal polymer film the conventional use of a light-emitting polymer of a polyvinylenophenylene or derivatives containing a fluorescent pigment. See Table 1 in column 20 of Hayashi et al for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the platen cover of Seachman et al, as modified by Washio et al, with a light-emitting polymer coating containing the fluorescent pigment as taught by Hayashi et al in order to achieve the high light reflectance effect as desired.

Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seachman et al in view of Washio et al as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Tuhro(5,017,963). Seachman et al, as modified by Washio et al teach all that is claimed except for the substrate includes a regular pattern of white color spots. Tuhro teaches in a similar imaging device including a platen cover 350 having a surface 352 which is provided with a printed pattern containing white color spots. See Fig. 4B and column 6, lines 27-36 in Tuhro for

example. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the platen cover surface of Seachman et al, as modified by Washio et al with the fluorescent coating in a printed pattern containing white color spots since Washio et al do teach to cover the platen cover surface partially with a fluorescent color coating.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ren L. Yan whose telephone number is 571-272-2173. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on 571-272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Ren L Yan  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2854

Ren Yan  
June 10, 2005